

REMARKS/ ARGUMENTS

The foregoing amendment and the following arguments are provided to impart precision to the claims, by more particularly pointing out the invention, rather than to avoid prior art.

35 U.S.C. § 103(a) Rejections

Examiner rejected claims 1, 2, 4-20, 22-35 and 37-66 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent 6,088,370 (hereinafter "Bell") in view of U.S. Patent 6,101,566 (hereinafter "Woods").

To establish *prima facie* obviousness of a claimed invention, all the claim limitations must be taught or suggested by the prior art. *In re Royka*, 490 F.2d 981, 180 USPQ 580 (CCPA 1974). (Manual of Patent Examining Procedure (MPEP) ¶ 2143.03).

Independent claims 1, 16, 29, 30, 47, and 50 of the present application includes limitations not disclosed or taught by the Bell or Woods. As a result, the independent claims 1, 16, 29, 30, 47, and 50 are patentable over Bell in view of Woods.

In particular, the independent claims include the limitation, or limitation similar thereto, of an interface provides a point-to-point connection between the MCH and the ICH, exclusive of an external bus connected directly to the interface, and peripheral components only connected to MCH via the single interface between the MCH and ICH.

Bell, however, does not disclose an interface between an MCH and ICH, with peripheral components only connected to MCH via the single interface between the MCH and ICH. Rather, Bell discloses a controller coupled to multiple bus expander bridges to provide multiple interfaces to interconnect peripheral components to the controller.

Therefore, considering applicant's independent claims 1, 16, 29, 30, 47, and 50 of the present application include limitations not disclosed or taught by the Bell or Woods, applicant's independent claims are patentable over Bell in view of Woods.

In addition, applicants' remaining claims depend from at least one of the independent claims mentioned above. As a result of depending from one of the independent claim, the remaining claims include the distinguishing limitations discussed above, and are therefore also patentable over Bell in view of Woods.

CONCLUSION

Applicants respectfully submit the present application is in condition for allowance. If the Examiner believes a telephone conference would expedite or assist in the allowance of the present application, the Examiner is invited to call John Ward at (408) 720-8300, x237.


Authorization is hereby given to charge our Deposit Account No. 02-2666 for any charges that may be due.

Respectfully submitted,

BLAKELY, SOKOLOFF, TAYLOR & ZAFMAN

Date: _____

7/19/04



John P. Ward
Reg. No. 40,216

12400 Wilshire Boulevard
Seventh Floor
Los Angeles, CA 90025-1026
(408) 720-8300